

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.580 of 2017

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 16775 of 2015

=====

Dinesh S/o Sri Akhileswar Prasad Singh, resident of -Old Lal Kothi, Alkapuri
More, P.S.-Gardanibagh, District-Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Cabinet Secretary of India, namely, Sri Pradeep Kumar Sinha
2. THE Sri Pradeep Kumar Sinha, Cabinet Secretary, Government of India, Rastrapati Bhawan, New Delhi-110004.
3. Sri Rajiv Mehrishi, the Home Secretary, Government of India, S/o not Known, Central Secretariat, New Delhi-110001.
4. Suresh Chandra, Law Secretary, Government of India, S/o not Known, Central Secretariat, New Delhi-110001
5. The State of Bihar through Anjani Kumar Singh the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
6. Sri Anjani Kumar Singh the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, S/o not known, old Secretariat, Patna-800001
7. Sri Surendra Prasad Sharma, Law Secretary, Son of Not Known, Govt. of Bihar Old Secretariat, Patna.
8. Sri Ram Balak Mahto, Advocate General, Bihar, S/o Not Known, Advocate General Office, High Court, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dinesh (in person)
For Union of India	:	Mr. S.D. Sanjay, A.S.G. Mr. Anshuman Singh, CGC
For the State		Mr. Lalit Kishore - PAAG 1 Mr. Manish Dhari Singh, AC to PAAG-1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT



(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 10-04-2017

Inter alia contending that certain guidelines issued on 17.11.2016 by this Court in C.W.J.C. No.16775 of 2015 has not been followed and in violation to the same steps are being taken for appointment of public prosecutrix and government advocates, this application has been filed for initiating action for contempt.

We have considered the submission made and the show cause filed by the State Government, the proceedings of the meeting of the Department held on 2.12.2016 and the action proposed to be taken in the matter and we are of the considered view that this is not a fit case where action for contempt should be initiated.

In case the petitioner has any grievance with regard to the decision taken vide Annexure-D in the meeting dated 2.12.2016, the petitioner should challenge the same in accordance with law by invoking the jurisdiction of a competent court for the said purpose. Initiating action for contempt, in our considered view, is not called for.

Accordingly, finding no case for initiating action for contempt, the application is disposed of.

Liberty shall be available to the petitioner to take recourse to such provisions of law as may be permissible in case



grievance is still subsisting with regard to the consequential action taken by the respondents.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Sudhir Singh, J)

K.C.jha/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	18.4.2017
Transmission Date	N/A

